

## POLITICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT OF THE IDEAS DIALOGICAL ETHICS

\*Hesse R.<sup>1</sup>,

\*<sup>1</sup> PhD, habilitated doctor of political sciences,

Freiburg University, Germany

e-mail: [hesse\\_r@gmail.com](mailto:hesse_r@gmail.com)

**Annotation.** To find an answer to the role of dialogical ethics in the philosophical and political aspect, we used an interdisciplinary approach, analyzing the work of K.O. Appel “Ethics and the Theory of Rationality: Selected essays”, who developed its main provisions. It is shown that dialogic ethics is based on global and universal characteristics. Dialogic ethics is one of the diplomatic tools and a mechanism for conflict resolution in world politics and international relations. It is determined that communication and means of language play an essential role in dialogic ethics, when there is an exchange of opinions, consultations, discussions, negotiations, meetings on problems of world politics and international relations, reflection and reflection in the form of finding ways to solve a particular situation. It is proved that dialogic ethics, using morality and law as forms of regulation of the international political process, can solve the problems of relations between states, but the philosophy of power, the desire for it, taking into account the difference between states and the political elite, taking into account the increasing geopolitical competition, cannot always overcome and solve the problem. The relevance of the topic is due to the increasing role of dialogue and the ethics of dialogue in modern world politics and international relations. Observing the ethics of dialogue revitalizes normal relations between States and peoples in difficult modern geopolitical and geo-economic conditions. The purpose of the article is to discuss the philosophical and political aspect of the ideas of dialogical ethics of the issue, about approaches and ideas in line with its modern concepts.

**Key words:** politics, idea, dialogical ethics, philosophy, theoretical reason, international relations, conflict, discourse

### **Basic provision**

The basic reflections of Ethics, the so called dialogical Ethics, have been elaborated by Karl-Otto Appel (1922-2017) [1]. Because dialogue is an essential element of communication for international relation, world politics and political leaders, we would like to present the basic ideas of dialogical ethics as philosophical and political aspect.

Our critical reasoning can differentiate between what is correct and what is not; in other words, between *true* and *false*. One might also add those things about which we cannot determine either their truth or their falsity. But this is also a question of truth: Is it true that (for the present, or in principle) we do not know whether or not something is true? “Let your word be yes, yes; no, no”, as we find in the Bible.

We cannot reinvent our critical reasoning every day. That we possess it is something we owe to the “groundwork” laid by our ancestors. That is to say, the tools with which our reasoning performs its critical work have been developed by cultural labor.

We have to know whether a thing is false or not. We have to know whether the quality of thing not for “academic” reasons, but rather because we could not survive otherwise. If I do not know whether or not the mushroom I am about to eat is poisonous, I take the risk of dying for my ignorance. If I have erred in calculating the re-entry angle of a space capsule as it returns to earth, it may be that the whole crew will pay for my error with their lives.

### **Introduction**

The relevance of the topic is due to the increasing role of dialogue and the ethics of dialogue in modern world politics and international relations. Observing the ethics of dialogue revitalizes normal relations between States and peoples in difficult modern geopolitical and geo-economic conditions.

The purpose of the article is to discuss the philosophical and political aspect of the ideas of dialogical ethics of the issue, about approaches and ideas in line with its modern concepts. We must know the realm of theoretical reason and the realm of practical reason. It's not about inventing something new, it's about giving the dialogue an ethical focus to resolve, for example, conflicts.

### **Description of materials and methods**

An interdisciplinary approach, namely political science and philosophy, made it possible to achieve the purpose of the study: the main ideas of dialogical ethics in complex geopolitical and geo-economic conditions. Analysis of K.-O. Appel's work “Ethics and the Theory of Rationality: Selected Essays” as one of the main general logical methods used to identify these basic ideas.

Such approaches as the descriptive method on the example of the work of I. Kant “Critique of Practical Reason” reveals the applied nature of ideas in the modern digital and full of threats world [2]. Based on these empirical data, the synthesis method made it possible to collect various aspects of the studied issue into a single whole and to obtain research results and formulate conclusions.

### **Results**

Most situations in which the question of truth presents itself are not as dramatic as this. Most are in fact trivial and insignificant: Will it rain or not; should I take an umbrella? How much fuel does the car consume that I would like to buy; can I afford it? And so on.

The question of truth arise in connection with our knowledge of the world and also in connection with our actions within it. On the one hand, we must know: Is it *true* that a space capsule re-entering the atmosphere at an angle of so many degrees and a speed of so many kilometers per hour heats up by so many degrees? On the other hand we must also know: Is it *true* that it would be better if the heat shield around the capsule were twice as thick as it currently is – therefore, that it *should* be made thicker?

Questions of truth appear in the realm in which we need to know *what is the case*, as well as in the realm in which we need to know what we *should and should not do*. We can call the first realm the realm of “theoretical reason” and the second,

the realm of “practical reason”. For example, it’s necessary to know the history of Central Asia for understand topical problems of this region.

We have a question: But what is wrong with self-contradiction? Don’t we sometimes say of a deceased person, in sympathy and even with a bit of admiration, “Even in his contradictions he was great”?

We say this because we sometimes find human failings endearing (so long as they are not too serious). We also know of our own individual weaknesses and tend to turn a blind eye to them. It makes our life a little easier. But if we in all seriousness were to accept self-contradiction without proviso, we would be forced to accept also its opposite, the *refusal* of self-contradiction; and second, in a serious circumstance, we would not need much time to decide on which side of the argument we stand. Suppose we are, for example, running a construction company and would like to know from the engineer who has constructed our newest bridge whether it can carry the loads that are expected. Suppose he answers “Yes and no”. We would surely respond, taken aback or angry, that this is a contradiction, and if he were to insist further on his answer, perhaps propounding the benefits of self-contradiction, we would send him to get his walking papers, or perhaps to a psychiatrist to see if his head is in order. Today we have a lot of contradictions in the ecological sphere: to have a car is good, but it’s so lot of CO<sub>2</sub>.

If we admit that we should not let our actions be steered by our natural instincts, we still have to acknowledge that without our natural *senses* we would not be able to recognize anything or, in any case, that we would not get very far in our search for knowledge.

If someone had no senses *at all* – how would he perceive anything, and how could we find out from him whether he had perceived anything? On the other hand, it is not the case that the “impressions” that reach us via our senses already have the quality of knowledge - certainly not in a manner that is reliable. Reliable knowledge is obtained only when two further aspects are taken into consideration: The *reason* of the individual (receiving sensual impressions), and the discursive *co-subjectivity* unavoidably inherent in every act of reason. In other words, reliable knowledge always, in this sense, presupposes co-subjectivity.

The registering and assimilating is the result of an act of reason. The fact that our senses transmit to us the impression of “something” is only possible because the idea of “something” exists in our reason. The notion that our sense data has to do with things that are “there” is something that our reason provides; it is not in the data itself. The development of concepts which enable us to apprehend reality and thereby obtain knowledge is an important cultural accomplishment.

This mean there is no “solitary” recognition. There may be, but only in rudimentary form. Even animals which hardly communicate with one another, are able to recognize things. And Kaspar Hauser (a 19<sup>th</sup> Century German youth, infamous, as he himself asserted in his later life, for spending his youth locked in a darkened dungeon isolated from the outside world, having never been introduced to language) recognized that which was shoved into his cell as food, even though, as the story goes, no one had ever spoken to him [3]. It may be that those communicative faculties of the brain, which are necessary for the working out and

refinement of knowledge-enabling concepts, achieve a rudimentary, solitary perception. These abilities must be present in each individual, otherwise they could not be activated in situations of learning and teaching.

In diametric opposition to this, all recognition only takes place in the consciousness of the individual, that there is no world around him, but rather that it is all just an illusion.

In attempting to discover the facts of the world around us, we are (if this attempt is more than rudimentary) dependent on our fellow human beings. Even in posing the simplest question, like “Is this democratic State?”, we transcend our subjectivity in various ways: We turn to someone else (from whom we hope to obtain the knowledge that we ourselves lack), and in doing so, we use the medium of language, which we have acquired through a long process of communication with other human beings [4].

We *need* the information that we want to get but cannot acquire on our own. But even supposing someone, as an experiment, would completely refrain from posing questions, in order to demonstrate the possibility of this task to his discussion partner, who in contrast defends its impossibility (that inter-subjectivity is unavoidable) – even this demonstration would be a demonstration *for* someone, that is, it would entail an inter-subjective context. Furthermore, we could not maintain this position (that it is possible to live without the asking of questions) if we had during our lives, e.g. as children, really held and practiced this view! As children, we pestered our parents and others around us to the point of exasperation with questions like “Why is that?”, “Why is the number of conflicts increasing?”, “What are their reasons?”, “How can it be minimized?” and so on. Without having passed through this early learning process, with its endless questions and answers, we would not now, as adults, be able to take part in a discussion about the avoidability or unavoidability of inter-subjectivity. Had we not posed seriously meant questions earlier, we would still be the small, ignorant creatures we once were.

And here we can repeat the argumentation of the previous answer: Certainly, one could decide, as a thought experiment, never to ask serious questions (strictly speaking this won't work, since a world in which we ask no serious questions could not even be perceived in a manner that is anything more than rudimentary – because any more than the most rudimentary perception requires us to pose seriously meant questions). As we can see from the trivial example of the conflicts, our life expectancy would be short without preventive measures of states.

It's very interesting what leads us (as early as in childhood) to ask questions? Whatever the cause, in doing so we exercise an ability that is part of our makeup as rational beings. Why the world, our life and our reason (and therefore this capability of asking questions) should exist – this is something we don't know. In asking “Why?”, however, we are (reflectively) referred to the categories of world, life, reason (and with it freedom) as irreducible concepts, which we implicitly recognize in the very act of questioning. Such questions about implicit conditions - in other words, the reflection about “conditions for the possibility of...” - are, as mentioned before, what Kant called “transcendental” [2].

## Discussion

A propos freedom: Does it really exist? What about the opposing view that everything is predetermined – even processes in the brain, which is supposedly the source of our “freedom”? There are many who defend this view. This is again a “paper doubt”. And again, the same answer:

1) If everything is predetermined, then so is this view. But this cannot be the intention. In order to use this idea in a discussion, it must first be considered an argument, which in itself presupposes a kind of freedom of thought.

2) But if we simply overrule this objection (1) and declare everything (even argumentation) to be predetermined, we come to no meaningful result, for then everything in our world is just as it has always been, except that we have the additional linguistic burden of calling everything predetermined

3) Let us once again follow an adherent of this view to his bank and observe his reaction when the teller informs him that an inescapable chain of cause and effect has determined that yesterday’s salary deposit cannot be paid out.

How can we more concretely describe this inter-subjectivity, which is contained in every simple question? What sort of relationship do we enter into when we ask someone a question?

With every question we ask, we necessarily accept basic shared discourse-related responsibilities, for example with respect to:

1) *Choice of words*: There are certain *rules* governing the use of words which I agree to follow and which I expect to be followed by my partner in discourse;

2) *Sincerity*: The question I pose is meant sincerely and I expect that my partner will answer me with similar sincerity. This also means that he will tell me when he actually knows no answer, has only a partial one, or has doubts about it;

3) *Trans-subjective openness*: When my partner can only give an unsatisfactory answer or no answer at all to my question, I can expect that he will help me find *someone* who can answer it, since he understands that he, as an individual, must put himself second in the pursuit of truth; in other words, that every question posed seriously is in fact addressed not specifically to him, but to *every* rational being and thus is meant to be virtually universalistic.

4) *Justification*: I can expect that my partner answers not only with a statement, but that he is prepared to tell me *why* he thinks this statement is the correct (true) answer.

5) *Argumentative discourse*: I can expect my discursive partner not only to give me the justifications for his answer, but also to be willing to respond to objections that I may present; in other words, to be willing to enter into an argumentative dialogue with me, one in which justifications and counter-justifications are weighed against one another.

6) *Rules of argumentation*: Such a dialogue is only possible in the framework of certain rules of logic, and the participants must agree to adhere to these.

7) *Openness to revision*: When new information is received which has the potential to affect the outcome of the argument, the participants must be willing to take this into account and, if applicable, to revise any conclusions they had previously come to.

8) *Aiming toward consensus*: When there are no further arguments to be presented and the dialogue thus appears to be at an end, both participants agree to regard the result of the dialogue up to this point as the (possibly preliminary) answer to their posed question – this result is the *truth* of the matter as they have so far been able to determine.

It's necessary to mark that we wrote about discourse related responsibilities in this journal in 2019 N 3 [6].

There are more anthropological givens or responsibilities of communication that we might add to these lists. In any case, the above lists are not intended to be definitive.

It's very important to methodologically reconstruct such rules of dialogue, starting from the simplest speech acts and proceeding to elaborate linguistic structures, in order to make clear to us the mutual rights and duties that they entail.

We describe this "set of rules" as a kind of "minimal ethics". However, this form of ethics is not really so "minimal".

We cannot *derive* anything substantive *from* them, but we can *work with* these rules by applying them to concrete situations.

If we were to consider contents as the basis of ethics, and if those values were to conflict with one another, then these conflicts would not be resolvable, except by referring to supposedly "higher" values or propositions - which again could stand in conflict with one another - or by violent means [5]. Violence is in fact the "procedure" through which such substantive conflicts are often resolved. In the case of a conflict between states which each defend conflicting values, this "procedure" is war. Yet, in an age in which weapons of mass destruction and global environmental threats are spreading, war is not an option we can afford. War is now coupled with a previously unknown risk - an unrestrained modern war, fought with all military means available, would eradicate the human race, or leave little of it behind [7].

The search for non-military means of resolving conflicts is thus an existential necessity. All states – developed, developing etc. - wish peace, world without wars.

Primary, formal, basic rules actually presuppose value statements, for example the postulates of "seriousness" (of questions) and "equality" (of all human beings). It is true that the statements "You *should* ask serious questions (if you want the truth)!" and "You *should* accept the arguments of all persons with equal readiness (if you want the truth)!" are ethical postulates (general normative statements). They are not, however, *ascriptions* of value. They are not arbitrarily or randomly chosen. Rather, their acceptance is an inescapable precondition of the effort to find truth through dialogue; they cannot be denied. Even in attempting to do so, one would have to implicitly make use of them in order to explain and defend this denial.

Thus, the objection that was intended in the question above turns out to be, in reality, a valid demonstration of the minimal ethics inherent in it (as in any seriously meant question). This minimal ethics is not imposed and cannot be derived; it shows itself when, through transcendental reflection, we consider the conditions of possibility inherent in every serious question.

Just mentioned alternative, “solving conflicts by dialogue or by violence (war)”: will mankind succeed in solving its conflicts in a way that does not bring about its complete or near destruction?

Another ground for hope is the fact that multilateral agreements among states have been put in place (outside the UN), meant to mitigate or eliminate global environmental and military threats.

This anticipation usually works in everyday life. Yet, one never knows whether or not a counter-argument or further relevant information might still exist in the mind of someone who was not able to express it (either because he had been hindered, by means of power or simply by a lack of communicative infrastructure). Considering this last point, it is evident that even if, in a thought-experiment, we were to imagine that all restraints were eliminated and an ideal “Christian-communist” society - free from domination, based on the postulates of equality, freedom and solidarity - were fully realized, we would still find it impossible in practice to verify whether all possible counter-arguments have really been taken into consideration. In other words, even in the best of all possible worlds, anticipation would still be necessary [8].

And it is all the more necessary in a human world-society permeated to such a great degree and depth by power structures as ours!

Like Kant, transcendental-pragmatic philosophy admits that the realization of reason in the world *is* a utopian project, in the sense that it is based on counter-factual anticipation, but beyond Kant it observes that it is nevertheless at the same time *factually given*, insofar as this anticipation takes place and *must* take place [2].

The principle of virtual equality and reciprocity between all human beings, implicitly recognized in every seriously posed question, is something that stands in stark contrast to the existing political and economic relations of power. It’s an ever-present call to overcome these same relations. It’s an ever-present call. To overcome this contrast is impossible, given the character of the human being, but to strive for it gives sense and dignity to the history of mankind and to the life of the individual.

## **Conclusion**

Dialogic ethics is evaluated as a diplomatic tool and as a conflict resolution mechanism. The subject of dialogic ethics is the people, their safety and well-being. In the process of dialogical communication, there is an exchange of opinions, a search for ways to solve a particular difficult situation in world politics.

Dialogic ethics in the philosophical and political aspect represents the logical forms proper - concepts, understanding, comprehension, reflection and decision. And dialogic ethics acquires the importance of dynamic semantic schemes that allow understanding and mastering new formats of its use. A feature of dialogic ethics is the need to withstand the tension of contradictions when opposing sides and complex problems are combined. The conceptual and categorical apparatus of dialogical ethics includes the concepts of poverty, threat, cruelty, play, conflict, slavery and many others.

Truth, law, and war are difficult to combine in dialogic ethics, which means a shift in meanings in world politics. In modern conditions, the variants of dialogical ethics require an expansion of the philosophical and political context.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Appel K. –O. Ethics and the Theory of Rationality: Selected Essays. - Humanities Press International Inc., 1996. - 336 p.
- [2] Kant I. Critique of Practical Reason. 2nd edition/ Transl. by Mary Gregor. - Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [3] Heydenreuter R. König Ludwig I. und der Fall Kaspar Hauser / In: Staat und Verwaltung in Bayern. Festschrift für Wilhelm Volkert zum 75. Geburtstag /Ed. by K. Ackermann and A. Schmid. - Munich, 2003. - P.465.
- [4] Angeli F. La comunicazione umana. A cura di Umberto Curi. - Milano; Verlag: Angeli, 1985.
- [5] Alber K. Diskursethik und Diskursanthropologie. - München, 2002. - 286 S.
- [6] Hesse R. Education in a Kantian perspective and its importance in the present situation of politics // Bulletin of Ablai khan KazUIR&WL. Series «International Relations and Regional Studies». – 2019. - № 3. – P.7-21.
- [7] Mercier Lectures: The Response of Discourse Ethics to the Moral Challenge of the Human Situation As Such, Especially Today. - Peeters Publishers, 2001. - 180 p.
- [8] Kamlah W., Lorenzen P. Logical Propaedeutic: Pre-School of Reasonable Discourse Paperback. – Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1984.

## ПОЛИТИКО-ФИЛОСОФСКИЙ АСПЕКТ ИДЕЙ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ЭТИКИ

\* Гессе Р.<sup>1</sup>,

\*<sup>1</sup>Доктор PhD, хабилитированный доктор политических наук, профессор,  
Фрайбургский университет, Фрайбург, Германия  
e-mail: [hesse\\_r@gmail.com](mailto:hesse_r@gmail.com)

**Аннотация.** Чтобы найти ответ на роль диалогической этики в философско-политическом аспекте мы использовали междисциплинарный подход, проведя анализ работы К.-О. Ашеля “Этика и теория рациональности: избранные эссе”, который разработал основные ее положения. Показано, что в основе диалогической этики лежат глобальные и универсальные характеристики. Диалогическая этика является одним из дипломатических инструментов и механизмом разрешения конфликтов в мировой политике и международных отношениях. Определено, что существенную роль в диалогической этике играет коммуникация и средства языка, когда идет обмен мнениями, проходят консультации, дискуссии, переговоры, встречи по проблемам мировой политики и международных отношений, осмысление и рефлексия в виде поиска путей решения той или иной ситуации. Обосновано, что диалогическая этика, использующая мораль и право, как формы регуляции международного политического процесса, может решить проблемы взаимоотношений государств, но философия власти, стремление к ней с учетом разности государств и политической элиты, с учетом усиливающейся геополитической конкуренции не всегда может преодолеть и решить проблему. Актуальность темы обусловлена возрастающей ролью диалога и этики диалога в современной мировой политике и международных отношениях. Соблюдение этики диалога оживляет нормальные отношения между государствами и народами в сложных современных геополитических и геоэкономических условиях. Цель статьи - обсудить философско-политический аспект идей



диалогической этики вопроса, подходы и идеи, соответствующие его современным концепциям.

**Ключевые слова:** политика, идея, диалогическая этика, философия, практический разум, международные отношения, конфликт, дискурс

## ДИАЛОГТЫҚ ЭТИКА ИДЕЯЛАРЫНЫҢ САЯСИ- ФИЛОСОФИЯЛЫҚ АСПЕКТІСІ

\*Гессе Р.<sup>1</sup>

\*<sup>1</sup>PhD докторы, саяси ғылымдарының профессоры,  
Фрайбург университеті, Фрайбург, Германия  
e-mail: [hesse\\_r@gmail.com](mailto:hesse_r@gmail.com)

**Андатпа.** Философиялық-саяси аспектідегі диалогтық этиканың рөліне жауап табу үшін біз К.-О. Аппелдің "этика және рационалдылық теориясы: тандалған очерктер" атты еңбегіне талдау жасай отырып, пәнаралық тәсілді қолдандық. Диалогтық Этика жаһандық және әмбебап сипаттамаларға негізделгені көрсетілген. Диалогтік этика әлемдік саясат пен халықаралық қатынастардағы қақтығыстарды шешудің дипломатиялық құралдары мен тетіктерінің бірі болып табылады. Диалогтық этикада қарым-қатынас пен тіл құралдары маңызды рөл атқаратыны анықталды, пікір алмасу, консультациялар, пікірталастар, келіссөздер, әлемдік саясат пен халықаралық қатынастар мәселелері бойынша кездесулер, белгілі бір жағдайды шешудің жолдарын іздеу түріндегі түсінік пен рефлексия. Халықаралық саяси процесті реттеудің бір түрі ретінде мораль мен құқықты қолданатын диалогтық этика мемлекеттер арасындағы қарым-қатынас мәселелерін шеше алады, бірақ билік философиясы, оған ұмтылу, мемлекеттер мен саяси элитаның айырмашылығын ескере отырып, өсіп келе жатқан геосаяси бәсекелестікті ескере отырып, мәселені әрдайым жеңе және шеше алмайды. Тақырыптың өзектілігі қазіргі әлемдік саясат пен халықаралық қатынастардағы диалогтың рөлі мен диалог этикасының артуына байланысты. Диалог этикасын сақтау қазіргі күрделі геосаяси және геоэкономикалық жағдайларда мемлекеттер мен халықтар арасындағы қалыпты қатынастарды жандандырады. Мақаланың мақсаты – мәселенің диалогтық этика идеяларының философиялық және саяси аспектісін, оның заманауи тұжырымдамаларына сәйкес тәсілдер мен идеяларды талқылау.

**Тірек сөздер:** саясат, идея, диалогтық этика, философия, ақыл, халықаралық қатынастар, қақтығыс, дискурс

*Статья поступила 29.02.2024*